DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 423 CG 027 718

TITLE Staffing the Multilingually Impacted Schools of the 1990s. Proceedings of the National Forum on Personnel Needs for Districts with Changing Demographics (Washington, D.C., January 11-12, 1990).

INSTITUTION Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE May 90

NOTE 27p.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Schools; *Bilingual Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Enrollment Trends; *Limited English Speaking; Multilingualism; Teacher Recruitment; *Teacher Shortage

ABSTRACT

Participants at a conference on staffing multilingual schools reported that the rapid and significant increase in the number of limited English proficient (LEP) students throughout the country is compounding the existing problem of bilingual/English as a Second Language (ESL) staff shortages. The following concerns were outlined: (1) school districts are experiencing significant increases in the number of LEP students and in the number of languages represented; (2) increases in the number of LEP students are occurring in school districts with declining enrollments; (3) many LEP students have limited or no previous schooling; (4) it is difficult to locate trained and certified teachers to work with LEP students; (5) it is difficult to retain bilingual/ESL staff for a variety of reasons, including competition among school districts; and (6) there is a need to retrain monolingual teachers in school districts where the decline in overall enrollment does not permit the hiring of trained bilingual/ESL staff. The following key recommendations were made: (1) streamline certification requirements for bilingual/ESL personnel; (2) encourage the private sector to take a more active role in promoting the education of LEP students; (3) increase collaboration among institutions of higher education, school districts, and the U.S. Department of Education; (4) make a greater effort to disseminate information about effective practices in the field of bilingual/ESL education; and (5) integrate bilingual/ESL staff into the school program. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

National Forum on Personnel Needs for Districts with Changing Demographics

Staffing the Multilingually Impacted Schools of the 1990s

May 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This Forum Report was prepared with partial funding from the United States Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA). The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OBEMLA or the United States Department of Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

On January 11-12, 1990, with the support of the Secretary of Education, Dr. Lauro F. Cavazos, the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) convened a National Forum of educators to assess the personnel needs of districts with changing demographics. This is the first time that OBEMLA has invited school superintendents and other educators to Washington, D.C. for the express purpose of soliciting their advice. The objective of the Forum was to solicit input for planning and establishing OBEMLA's training program priorities for the coming decade. Forum participants identified several areas of concern and made recommendations to address staff training needs, in light of the rapid increases now taking place in the numbers of limited English proficient (LEP) students. OBEMLA will take their suggestions into consideration in planning and establishing future training priorities.

The Forum could not have been possible without the support of Secretary Cavazos. I would like to take this opportunity to thank him for his leadership.

I would also like to thank the following members of my staff for their contribution to the development of this report:

Dr. John Ovard
Ms. Harpreet Sandhu
Mr. William Wooten
Ms. Catalina Wilkison

In addition, I would like to recognize Ms. Robin Billington and Ms. Velma Robinson for providing logistical support for the Forum.

My special thanks to Dr. James Alatis and Dr. Rudy Chavez for their invaluable comments during the preparation of this report, and to Mr. Douglas Katz of Wasserman-Katz, who played a vital role in facilitating the Forum sessions.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to the Forum participants for their valuable contributions and for taking time out of their busy schedules to attend this Forum.

Rita Esquivel

CONTENTS

		Page
I	List of Participants	1
II	Executive Summary	3
III	Forum Report	5
IV	Conference Proceedings	11

FORUM PARTICIPANTS

Dr. James Alatis
Dean, School of Languages
and Linguistics
Georgetown University

Dr. Charles Almo
Interim General Superintendent
of Schools
Chicago Public Schools

Dr. Jack Ammons
Superintendent
Brownsville Independent
School District

Dr. Robert Bailey
Superintendent
Busby School District

Dr. Leonard Britton
Superintendent
Los Angeles City Public Schools

Dr. Rudy Chavez
Director, MRC
Arizona State University

Dr. John R. Correiro
Superintendent
Fall River Public Schools

Dr. Rudolph F. Crew
Superintendent
Sacramento City U.S.D.

Mr. Peter A. Eissele
Assistant Superintendent
for Human Resources
Albuquerque Public Schools

Dr. Donna B. Evans
Dean, College of Education
Wayne State University

Dr. Herman S. Garcia
Associate Professor of
Bilingual Education
Texas A&M University

Dr. Terrence Garner
Director of Personnel
Dade County Public Schools

Dr. Tom Giugni
Superintendent
Long Beach U.S.D.

Dr. Ira Goldenberg
Dean, College of Education
Florida International
University

Mr. Angel N. Gonzalez
Deputy Superintendent
Houston I.S.D.

Mr. Benjamin Gutierrez
Director of Personnel
Edgewood I.S.D.

Dr. Mark Karadenes
Assistant Superintendent
Santa Monica-Malibu U.S.D.

Ms. Carolyn Kelly
Personnel Director
Tucson Unified S.D.

Dr. Margie K. Kitano
Associate Dean for Faculty
Development and Research
San Diego State Univ.

Ms. Michele Kostem
Assistant Superintendent
Bethlehem Area S.D.

Mr. Hank Oyama
Associate Vice President
Multi-disciplinary Education
and Services
Pima Community College

Dr. Ronald S. Lemos
Assistant Vice Chancellor
The California State
University System

FORUM PARTICIPANTS CONTINUED

Mr. Andrew Raicevich
Executive Director
Division of Human Resources
Denver Public Schools

Dr. Alba Rosenmann
Associate Professor
of Secondary Education
Director, Bilingual Education
Ball State University

Ms. Nilda Soto Ruiz
Deputy Executive Director
Office of Recruitment
and Counseling
New York City Board of Education

Dr. John Steffens
Assistant Vice Provost
Public Responsibility
and Current Affairs
University of Oklahoma

Dr. Maria Torres
Director, Program in
Bilingual/Bicultural
Education
Columbia University
Teachers College

Dr. James R. Wood
Superintendent
United Independent S.D.

U.S. Department of Education

Dr. Ted Sanders
Under Secretary
U.S. Department of Education

Dr. Daniel Bonner (A)
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Elementary
and Secondary Education

Ms. Rita Esquivel
Director
Office of Bilingual Education
and Minority Languages Affairs

Dr. Leonard L. Haynes, III
Assistant Secretary
Office of Postsecondary
Education

Ms. Nancy Kennedy
Assistant Secretary
Office of Legislation
and Congressional Affairs

Mr. Charles E. M. Kolb
Deputy Under Secretary
Office of Planning,
Budget and Evaluation

Dr. John T. MacDonald
Assistant Secretary
Office of Elementary
and Secondary Education

Dr. Gilbert D. Roman
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Operations
Office of Civil Rights

Dr. William L. Smith (A)
Assistant Secretary
Office of Civil Rights

OBEMLA Senior Staff

Ms. Robin Billington
Mr. Rudolph J. Munis
Dr. John S. Ovard
Dr. Carmen Simich-Dudgeon
Ms. Catalina Wilkison
Mr. William A. Wooten

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On January 11-12, 1990, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) sponsored a Forum on "Staffing the Multilingually Impacted Schools of the 1990s."

KEY FORUM FINDINGS

Forum participants reported a rapid and significant increase in the number of limited English proficient (LEP) students throughout the country. In this regard, they made the following observations:

- Local education agencies (LEAs) are experiencing significant increases, both in the total number of LEP students and in the number of languages represented.
- Increases in the number of LEP students are occurring even in school districts with declining enrollments.
- Many students of all ages are entering school with limited or no previous schooling in addition to the inability to speak English.

The rapid increases in the number of LEP students is compounding the existing problem of bilingual/ESL (English as a Second Language) staff shortages. Participants voiced the following concerns with regard to their ability to staff LEP student classrooms:

- It is difficult to locate trained and certified teachers to work with LEP students.
- It is difficult to retain bilingual/ESL staff due to a variety of factors, such as competition among districts striving to attract bilingual/ESL staff through salary incentives.
- There is a need for re-training of monolingual teachers in school districts where the decline in overall enrollment does not permit the hiring of trained bilingual/ESL staff.

At the conclusion of the two-day Forum, participants made the following recommendations:

- Certification requirements for bilingual/ESL personnel should be streamlined.

- The corporate (private sector) community should be encouraged to take a more active role in promoting the educational success of LEP students.

- Dialogue and collaboration among institutions of higher education (IHEs), local education agencies (LEAs), and the U.S. Department of Education should be increased.

- A greater effort should be made to disseminate information about effective and promising practices in the field of bilingual/ESL education.

- LEAs should encourage school principals to fully integrate bilingual/ESL education staff into the school program.

Additional recommendations recorded in the conference proceedings, call for:

- The establishment of career ladders to provide formal training for aides, para-professionals, and other support staff.

- The involvement of more community colleges in the training of bilingual/ESL staff.

- The use of discretionary points to favor grant applications of first time applicants, i.e. schools not previously funded.

FORUM REPORT

On January 11-12, 1990, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) sponsored a Forum on "Staffing the Multilingually Impacted Schools of the 1990s." School superintendents, personnel directors, and university representatives from key institutions across the nation, along with Department of Education personnel, met to discuss the staffing needs for bilingual education in the coming decade. This report presents the findings and recommendations of the Forum participants.

I. FINDINGS

The Demographic Setting

National school enrollment information for 1988 indicates that of the 40 million children in public schools, almost 2 million, or 5 percent fit the definition of limited English proficient. The information provided by the Forum participants confirms these national figures. Additionally, they identified four growth patterns affecting staffing needs. The first is the continued rapid growth of LEP enrollment in districts with previously large concentrations of LEP students. The second is the proliferation of a variety of native languages in school districts. The third is the increase in the number of districts enrolling LEP students. Last, but perhaps most significant, is that these trends exist even in those districts that are reporting overall decreases in total school enrollment.

Los Angeles typifies school districts which are experiencing continued growth in their already significant LEP populations. Their LEP student population has grown from 15 percent of the total population in 1980, to 31 percent in 1989. For the state of California as a whole the number of LEP students increased by 16 percent in 1988, after averaging an 8 percent increase for the previous four years. For example, Long Beach Unified School District, had a LEP enrollment of 18,000 in 1989 (an increase of 20 percent from 1988) representing 44 languages. In two Texas school districts, Brownsville and Laredo, the LEP population is one third of the total enrollment (51 percent of the K-6 enrollment in Brownsville is LEP). More importantly, the future trend is for an increasing LEP population.

Urban centers such as Chicago and New York provide examples of the nationwide proliferation of various native languages. Each has student bodies which include speakers of over 100 languages. Although Spanish is the most frequently encountered language in federal bilingual/ESL programs, over 30 percent also serve students speaking such diverse languages as Apache, Arabic, Cherokee, Chinese, Greek, Korean, Russian, Tagalog, and Urdu. The LEP population seems to be scattering throughout the country

as various ethnic groups seeking jobs, move from their original ports of entry and resettle elsewhere. For example, Fall River, Massachusetts, an area with a traditionally low LEP enrollment, experienced an increase of 67 percent from 1985-1990, and now has joined Brownsville and Laredo, Texas in having a one-third LEP enrollment. Similarly, Lowell, Massachusetts, has experienced an increase due to secondary migration. According to Superintendent Leonard Britton of Los Angeles (previously Superintendent of Dade County, Florida), "The situation will have an impact on the entire country during the coming decade." To address this need OBEMLA conducted a special grant award competition in 1989 to assist recently (within the previous two years) impacted school districts. Fifty-five school districts applied for funds to serve recent enrollees. In recognition of this need Secretary Cavazos has proposed to conduct a similar competition in 1991.

Finally, all these gains and redistributions in LEP enrollments are occurring at a time when overall student enrollments are declining. Districts as geographically separated as Chicago, San Antonio, Busby (Montana), and Santa Monica (California) reported significant increase in LEP students despite a decline in their overall enrollment.

Staffing the Schools of the 1990s

The Forum participants, consisting of superintendents, assistant superintendents for personnel, and representatives from various colleges and universities, described four demographic trends that have major implications for staffing patterns in school districts. The most widely shared findings on this issue were: qualified new staff are hard to find and equally difficult to retain; existing staff are not adequately prepared to provide services to LEP students and the problem is aggravated by the increasing number of LEP students; and staffing needs extend beyond the classroom and include a wide array of support staff such as counselors, psychologists, nurses, and therapists.

In the field of bilingual/ESL education, as well as in others, teacher education, in the broader sense of the word, is still the heart of the matter. As people with a first language other than English choose to live in a wider variety of communities, it becomes crucial that teachers and schools are prepared to serve children who are either LEP, or come from a home where a language other than English is spoken. Whether or not bilingual/ESL staff are available, the monolingual teacher must be trained to meet the special needs and concerns of these children.

Although Los Angeles considers itself successful in its recruiting and hiring efforts for bilingual/ESL education staff, their success has been tempered by an ever increasing number of LEP enrollees. The system faces a shortage of almost 2,500 trained bilingual elementary teachers and 400 trained bilingual

secondary school teachers. The California State Department of Education's latest report of the Superintendents' Task Force on LEP Student Issues, published in May 1990, estimates the present shortage of bilingual teachers and language development specialists (ESL) at 20,000. Additionally, they are struggling with the problem of having over half of their present bilingual staff teaching under waivers. In many other districts these shortages are a present day reality as eligible LEP students can not receive bilingual or ESL instruction for want of trained instructional staff.

Finding trained and certified staff is difficult in bilingual/ESL education. One reason is the number of additional courses and the language proficiency required for certification. Another is the variability of certification requirements over time and from state to state. Finally, in some districts, a vacancy must occur before a bilingual/ESL teacher can be hired. According to one Forum participant, Dade County, Florida could use 1,500 qualified bilingual/ESL teachers, but has no vacancies to hire them. Once staff are recruited they face the "last-hired first fired" practice common to most school districts.

II. IMPLICATIONS

The changing demographics of the American classroom and the demand for qualified, talented, well-trained teachers has already affected the entire education system. The special instructional needs of LEP children are highly significant within the context of these changes. The way we respond to their needs will influence the nature of the American work force in the next century, and perhaps the very nature of the American society. Will we be able to continue as a nation which offers opportunity to succeed to all students, or will we foster a two-tier society? The participants at the Forum believed that we must take action now to ensure that this opportunity is available to all American school children.

Forum participants concluded that IHEs, LEAs, and state education agencies (SEAs) must set aside questions of "turf" and "precedence" and be prepared to assist one another to meet the current challenges. They called for the federal government to do a better job of providing leadership and facilitating improvements in staff training. Forum participants recognized that funding increases, although desirable, are not likely. However, better targeting of available funds and dissemination of the results of successful projects can help fill funding gaps. Finally, they stressed the importance of developing an awareness within the private sector (corporations and community service organizations) of the significance of educating LEP children. Support from the private sector will help provide children with the tools to fully participate in our society, while ensuring

that the American workforce remains competitive in the international arena.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

New Modes of Cooperation

Institutions of higher education, local and state education agencies, the federal government, and the private sector must cooperate more effectively. The following are areas specifically targeted by Forum participants.

Certification Requirements

A comprehensive catalogue of state certification requirements should be compiled to determine which competencies and qualifications are shared. Greater reciprocity among states should be explored. IHEs should facilitate transfer of credits in bilingual/ESL education from one institution to another and should be more mindful of certification requirements. Alternative certification should be pursued particularly for persons speaking "non-traditional" languages, such as Cambodian and Hmong. Research is needed on the impact of various state certification policies on bilingual/ESL education program achievement and the potential role of paraprofessionals (non-certified) or alternatively certified teachers in the classroom.

Private Sector Involvement

As the demographics of the workforce change the private sector should become more interested in improving the English language proficiency and education level of future workers. Also, the educational community should take on a more active role in soliciting support for bilingual/ESL education programs from the private sector.

Federal Leadership

The U.S. Department of Education can assist in these activities by:

1. Encouraging more dialogue and collaboration among IHEs, LEAs, and the Department of Education;

2. Facilitating business roundtables to discuss the importance of these programs for the workplace;

3. Encouraging better coordination and flexibility of federal resources at the local level (Migrant Education, Head Start, Bilingual Education, etc.);

4. Providing leadership in the review of certification requirements and increased reciprocity between states; and

5. Improving dissemination of information about effective and promising practices.

New Modes of Personnel Development

Forum participants believed that preparation of personnel for the bilingual and ESL classrooms and school settings could be improved in the following areas:

Recruiting and Encouraging Bilingual/ESL Education Staff

LEAs need to emphasize the recruitment of staff prepared to serve LEP students. LEAs should establish career ladders to prepare bilingual aides for teaching positions. Once recruited, staff should be supported and fully integrated into the school program. LEAs should encourage principals to ensure that the bilingual/ESL education program is not thought of as an adjunct program.

Enhancing Training

Inservice training should include: the most up-to-date assessments of student needs and effective teaching techniques, strategies for teaching previously unschooled students, and methodologies that are effective in teaching subject matter areas such as mathematics and science. Specific training in bilingual/ESL education should be required, not only for teaching positions, but for a variety of support and administrative staff positions. At a minimum, training should develop awareness of difficulties facing LEP children. A bilingual/ESL education component should be incorporated into existing staff development programs and focus especially on monolingual teachers who have LEP students in their classrooms.

Schools of Education

Participants agreed that institutions of higher education need to reassess the type of services they deliver, and the mode of delivery. They should consider inservice, on-site training as a legitimate component of their certification programs. They should consciously design programs for training the monolingual teacher who may never acquire bilingual/ESL certification, but has an important role in the education of LEP children. Finally, they should be conscious of the needs of non-teachers (administrators and other support staff) in the school setting for training in the dynamics of bilingual/ESL education.

Federal Leadership

The U.S. Department of Education can assist in these activities by:

1. Identifying and disseminating information about additional funding sources for staff development efforts as a supplement to Title VII funding;

2. Identifying and disseminating information to IHEs and LEAs on effective training techniques such as faculty institutes, demonstration areas, and conferences, etc;

3. Encouraging the funding of first time IHE applicants through priority points; and

4. Providing funding for programs to train non-bilingual/ESL staff, both teachers and administrators.

Conference Proceedings

National Forum on Personnel Needs for Districts with Changing Demographics

Theme: Staffing the Multilingually Impacted Schools of the 1990s

January 11-12, 1990

Introduction

On January 11-12, 1990, a representative group of school superintendents, assistant superintendents/personnel directors, and deans from institutes of higher education (IHEs) from around the country attended a Forum sponsored by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA). The Forum was designed to elicit from people in the field their impressions concerning the need for bilingual education in the 1990s and to allow them to make recommendations for a plan of action to address those needs.

The Forum was divided into smaller work sessions where participants were asked to respond to the following topics:

Topic I: The District Need. What is your sense of the demographic trends of limited English proficient (LEP) students in primary and secondary schools?

Topic II: The Personnel Need. As local education agencies (LEAs), can you obtain the staff you need?

Topic III: How to Address Personnel Needs. What modifications in bilingual/English as a second language (ESL) staff development programs do you think will help in the coming decade?

Topic IV: Next Steps. What future steps should be taken by LEAs, IHEs, and the Department of Education to better meet the needs of LEP students?

Topic I. The District Need

A number of Forum participants introduced recent studies on the numbers of LEP children needing bilingual/ESL services. Some studies have identified between 3.5 and 5 million LEP children. The school districts represented, made the following points regarding LEP students:

1. There is an increase in the number of limited English proficient students, even in school districts with declining populations.

2. There is an increase in the number of languages represented, especially Southeast Asian and some middle-Eastern languages.

3. Many students are arriving--at all grade levels--with limited prior schooling. (Many have no schooling at all).

4. The enrollment problems, which are likely to continue, affect school districts of all sizes.

5. Many districts across the nation are not yet in full compliance with their state's regulations governing minimum services required for LEP students. In some states 50 percent of the districts are not currently in compliance.

Topic II. The Personnel Need

According to a recent projection (Reynaldo F. Macias, Bilingual Teacher Supply and Demand in the United States, 1989), there is a current demand for 175,000 bilingual teachers, assuming a 20:1 student-teacher ratio. Forum participants made the following points about personnel needs:

1. There is a definite need for qualified bilingual/ESL teachers.

2. Qualified staff are hard to find and hard to retain.

3. Certification and other bureaucratic roadblocks impede the hiring of bilingual/ESL teachers. Alternative approaches (i.e., waiver of traditional requirements) are being used in some states and look promising.

4. Attracted by salary incentives (many districts offer dollar supplements as high as $5,000 for bilingual teachers), some bilingual teachers have transferred to the bilingual program but have not fully espoused bilingual teaching philosophies.

5. Burnout is high among bilingual/ESL teachers. This is often due to such factors as:

   a) A lack of administrative support for bilingual/ESL education at the local level (exacerbated by racial and gender tones of the LEA hierarchy);

   b) Lack of collegiality with their monolingual colleagues (bilingual teachers commonly enjoy the

help of aides, have smaller class sizes, and are better paid);

c) Demanding school-community activities (many bilingual/ESL teachers have to make regular home visits);

d) Advocacy responsibilities that transcend the school day into many late-evening community meetings;

e) A belief among many staff outside of the bilingual/ESL program that LEP children have less ability than other children;

f) An accountability system that ignores important student characteristics (e.g., students do not excel in tests that are in a language they have not yet mastered);

g) The strain of responding to the special needs of many LEP students who arrive in the United States with no prior schooling;

h) Inadequate number and quality of appropriate instructional materials; and

i) The general lack of a local support system for bilingual/ESL teachers.

6. Bilingual/ESL teachers tend to migrate to other districts in search of higher pay and better working conditions. Some bilingual/ESL teachers who remain in the district transfer to non-bilingual/ESL positions.

7. There is a universal shortage of bilingual/ESL teachers who have specialized in subject-matter areas, especially the sciences, special education, and vocational education. Bilingual staff qualified to serve in ancillary staff positions (e.g., psychologists, physical therapists, early childhood specialists, and administrators) are also in short supply.

8. Some districts with increasing LEP enrollment, stable or declining overall enrollments, and a stable, tenured, monolingual teaching staff cannot determine how to provide bilingual/ESL services.

9. Districts do not have effective college recruiting programs.

10. Only a minority of graduates from IHE bilingual programs are native speakers of the target language. This is because of inadequate financial aid; most students from low-income homes cannot afford to go to college.

Topic III. How to Address Personnel Needs

1. LEAs need to tell IHEs what they need concerning all aspects of the training of bilingual/ESL teachers. Working through college presidents and deans may be an effective way to do this.

2. Bilingual/ESL teachers will need to respond to the diversity that exists within today's LEP student population.

   a) Teachers need training to handle previously unschooled children.

   b) Teachers need more indepth training in teaching methodology.

   c) Subject matter areas (e.g., math) need to be addressed more vigorously.

3. IHEs need to train more bilingual psychologists, physical therapists, teachers for vocational education, special education, and early childhood education, as well as counselors, administrators, and other ancillary professionals.

4. Monolingual staff need to be trained to be more effective with LEP students.

5. SEAs, LEAs, and IHEs together need to develop a way that will streamline certification requirements for bilingual/ESL personnel.

6. School systems need to develop support systems sensitive to the special needs of bilingual/ESL teachers (e.g., peer acceptance, top-down support, community relations, accountability systems).

7. Existing scholarship aid should be increased to attract native bilingual students (full-time or part-time) from low-income backgrounds.

8. Since "good teachers" are good within the context of their particular learners, educational research needs to be more cognizant of learner characteristics.

9. The U.S. Department of Education can strengthen the public support for bilingual/ESL education by spearheading more meetings with national leaders on the district and IHE levels, convening business roundtables to discuss the importance of bilingual/ESL personnel in the workplace, disseminating experiences of other countries with bilingual/ESL education, and by supporting organizations such as the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

10. Bilingual/ESL teachers who are on the front line of curriculum change should realize that not having full public acceptance from all sectors may be "the burden of innovation."

11. There is a need for improved communication among all those involved in bilingual/ESL education programs. IHEs and LEAs need to talk more practically about how to make bilingual/ESL education programs more effective. Deans and university presidents need to become more involved. Teacher trainers need to be more in tune with current practices and needs. Areas to be discussed should include recruitment, course development, and training.

12. Many LEAs need to incorporate a bilingual/ESL component into existing staff development/inservice training programs. The U.S. Department of Education may want to support research in identifying particularly successful inservice strategies.

13. IHEs and LEAs need to establish closer relationships with the private sector.

14. Since learning conditions differ from district to district, continued experimentation with diverse bilingual/ESL methodologies is encouraged.

Topic IV. Next Steps

OBEMLA

1. Include requirements in regulations for coordination and collaboration between IHEs and LEAs, not just in proposal preparation, but also in research design and in the processes of program and staff development.

2. Focus on the quality of staff development rather than on the numbers of people who are involved in staff development. For example, project plans that include training 1000 teachers in two workshops a year should

receive less support than plans that provide long-term development for 30 teachers.

3. Consider the following incentives for IHEs:

   a) Research component with any training that is provided;

   b) Administrative support (release time) for project directors who are trying to get tenure. Working towards tenure requires extensive research and writing, tasks that compete with everything directors have to do administratively; and

   c) Special consideration to IHEs and LEAs that are closely involved with the problem.

4. Provide LEA funding for staff training and development and for "procurement" of IHEs, and alternative delivery systems.

5. Encourage more involvement of community colleges in the training of bilingual/ESL staff. In request for proposals, OBEMLA could promote more collaborative efforts between two and four-year colleges. OBEMLA should not penalize community colleges and small LEAs for having a small proposal writing staff. OBEMLA could also set aside funds specifically for community colleges, especially those in urban areas, for use in training bilingual/ESL teachers.

6. Study the effects of standardized testing procedures on bilingual/ESL program accountability. For instance, some non-English students are tested in English and some English-only students are tested in another language.

7. Test both the bilingual and the ESL education components.

8. Initiate faculty institutes, to include demonstration and research centers and to train IHE faculty to work with LEAs. A center focusing on language might also be initiated.

9. Continue the drive to solve basic problems concerning certification and appropriate models of bilingual/ESL education.

10. Compile lists of required competencies for bilingual/ESL teachers according to different types of certifications.

11. Conduct a comprehensive study to identify and compare certification requirements throughout the country to determine what competencies/qualifications are shared and which ones are most likely to bring about the desired results. The whole issue of reciprocity should be examined carefully.

12. Promote the development of mechanism among IHEs to facilitate the transfer of student credits in bilingual/ESL education from one institution to another.

13. Contract a study to identify state certification requirements for bilingual/ESL teachers and to propose ways to streamline these requirements.

14. Share with certifying agencies the mechanisms for certifying teachers in languages that are not taught in colleges.

15. Establish a career ladder for aides and paraprofessionals and provide a formal training program for aides and other support/ancillary positions.

16. Broaden the number of languages that are underwritten to include more "nontraditional" languages.

17. Research is needed in the following areas:

    a) The effect of teacher expectations on student achievement;

    b) The uses of technology in improving bilingual/ESL programs and reducing the cost of providing services;

    c) Effects of the early and late exit processes;

    d) The role that parents and communities play in bilingual/ESL programs;

    e) The role of paraprofessionals in the classroom;

    f) The impact of various state certification policies on bilingual/ESL program achievement and drop-out rates;

    g) Issues affecting drop-out rates and student and teacher retention;

h) Ways to improve teacher retention to include characteristics that positively affect teacher retention in bilingual/ESL education;

i) Strategies for teaching students who are not literate in their native language;

j) Teacher orientation; and

k) Promising practices (This research could be compiled and disseminated, possibly during a series of conferences. There is no need to continually re-invent the wheel.)

18. There is a need to identify additional funding sources appropriate to bilingual/ESL programs as a supplement to Title VII funding. Possible sources might include Special Education, Teacher Corps, Migrant Education, Bilingual Education, and Head Start. OBEMLA should pull agencies together to see what can be done collaboratively. State sources might also be included.

19. Before approaching outside programs and agencies, review the effectiveness of the existing program structure. As a radical move, one participant suggested that OBEMLA consider abolishing all departments of bilingual education bureaucracies at the LEA and IHE levels and replacing them with joint appointments. The local hierarchy of IHEs and LEAs would be abolished. Others recommended that OBEMLA continue to support the bilingual/ESL education program hierarchy, as currently established, and the developmental bilingual education programs, grades K-12. These should produce a larger pool of students who can return to LEAs and provide better teachers.

20. Facilitate the involvement of the corporate world. Such involvement would make a case for corporate benefits. Perhaps a forum with the corporate community would be helpful.

21. Continue funding existing teacher preparation programs. (Two Forum attendees were former OBEMLA fellows.)

22. Fund regional demonstration areas staffed by IHEs, LEAs, and the Department of Education. These areas might be responsible for providing demonstrations, information dissemination, and training.

23. Provide additional funds for classes for non-bilingual teachers. OBEMLA should be more flexible in funding and give preference to districts with the demographics

that document the need for more funding of bilingual/ESL programs.

24. Provide more funds for quality staff development. More statutory change is needed to allow LEAs to apply for additional staff development dollars.

25. As a follow-up to this Forum, sponsor a Policy Resolution Conference. This conference could be scheduled separately or held in conjunction with an already scheduled conference.

26. Set targets for student achievement and community involvement, and give rewards and penalties when these targets are or are not met. OBEMLA might also set target incentives for IHEs to cooperate with LEAs or for LEAs to meet accountability standards.

27. Relax proposal writing requirements. Project staff spend too much effort writing proposals. OBEMLA could specify page limits for proposals.

28. Consider the use of discretionary points or other mechanisms to favor funding applications from first time applicants, i.e., schools not previously funded. For these first time applicants, perhaps no proposal would be required.

29. Incorporate desired outcomes into any Requests for Proposal (RFPs) that are released.

LEAs

1. Push for more on-site training by IHEs.

2. Support programs to teach second languages to populations that are English speaking.

3. Support language retention in those students who are fluent in a native language. Those who have the language should be encouraged to maintain it and become literate in it.

4. Organize a forum with IHEs to discuss national issues concerning certification.

5. Stay committed to the cause of bilingual/ESL education and the children who are being served. Field staff have first hand knowledge and understanding of the students' needs and should speak and act in the students' behalf.

IHEs

1. Reach out to teachers on-site to do collaborative research.

2. Increase contact with and involvement of community colleges.

3. Continue to generate innovative training models for inservice teachers.

4. Be more involved in LEA on-site inservice teacher training.

5. Review requirements for pre-service training and the language requirements for all undergraduate students.

Other

Dr. Leonard Britton of the Los Angeles City Public Schools recommended that during the development of bilingual education programs, special emphasis be placed on the following areas:

a) Proper identification of students whose primary language is other than English (linguistic minority students);

b) Proper placement of linguistic minority students in classes by using valid instruments, appropriate bilingual personnel to administer the tests, and appropriate student support services such as guidance and counseling, psychological evaluation, and special education/learning disability or exceptional child education;

c) Proper placement of qualified bilingual staff in the public school system;

d) Proper location of bilingual classes;

e) Utilization of relevant instructional materials;

f) Development of adequate training in bilingual education for school personnel through bilingual education/ESL and foreign languages;

g) Propose competency-based model for teacher training in multilingual/multicultural education;

h) Participation of parents in school activities; and

i) Expansion of services provided by the U.S. Department of Education.

Dr. Donna Evans of Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan presented for consideration the following recommendations that appeared in the January 10, 1990 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education:

1. Insure that language minority students start school prepared to learn.

2. Insure that academic achievement of language minority youth is at a level that will enable them, upon graduation from high school, to enter the workforce or college fully prepared to be successful and not in need of remediation.

3. Significantly increase the participation of language minority students in higher education, with a special emphasis on the study of mathematics, science, and engineering.

4. Strengthen and increase the number of teachers of language minority students.

5. Strengthen the school-to-work transition so that language minority students who do not choose college leave high school prepared with the skills necessary to participate productively in the world of work and with the foundation required to upgrade their skills and advance their careers.

6. Provide quality out-of-school educational experiences and opportunities to supplement the schooling of language minority youth and adults.

Achievement is a Child's Universal Language

U.S. Department of Education

Office of Bilingual Education
and Minority Languages Affairs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE